

REMARKS

The present application includes pending claims 1-31, all of which have been rejected. By this Amendment, claims 1, 8 and 25 have been amended.

Claims 1-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 7,065,778 (“Lu”). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least reasons previously discussed during prosecution and the following:

I. Lu Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-17

Claim 1 recites, in part, “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives a **request that identifies** one of the associated first and second network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery” Claim 8 recites, in part, “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second protocol addresses** and that receives a **request that identifies one of the associated first and second protocol addresses** and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second protocol addresses** to support delivery”

Lu “relates to the field of utilizing personalized video recorders and other similar types of devices to distribute television programming.” *See* Lu at column 1, lines 7-11. In particular, Lu discloses a system in which a user is able to record a show that is transmitted in another broadcast area. *See id.* at Abstract.

For example, Lu describes the following:

Specifically, personalized video recorder 200 is coupled to the Internet 302 such that it can receive an electronic programming guide (EPG) containing worldwide television programming from

an EPG server computer 304. The user of personalized video recorder 200 utilizes the EPG to request delivery of a specific television show that may not be available to him or her. Upon reception of the request from personalized video recorder 200, EPG server computer 304 locates via Internet 302 one or more personalized video recorders... situated within a broadcast region of the requested television show. Subsequently, EPG server computer 304 programs one or more personalized video recorders... to record the requested television show when it is broadcast by a television content provider.... Once the personalized video recorders... record the television show, one or more of the personalized video recorders may transmit it to EPG server computer 304 which then transmits it to the requested personalized video recorder 200. In this manner, the present embodiment enables personalized video recorder 200 to order and receive specific television shows that are unavailable from its television content provider....

Lu at column 6, lines 39-61. Thus, Lu discloses a system in which a user sends a recording request that is received by a server computer via the Internet. The server computer then locates a recorder within the broadcast region of the show, and then sends the recorded show back to the requesting user.

Lu does not describe, teach, or suggest, however, “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives a request that **identifies** one of the associated first and second network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery,” as recited in claim 1, or “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second protocol addresses** and that receives a request that **identifies one of the associated first and second protocol addresses** and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second protocol addresses** to support delivery,” as recited in claim 8. Instead, Lu merely discloses that a user of a PVR requests delivery of a specific television show,

at which point a server computer **arbitrarily** locates another PVR in a particular broadcast area to record the show for the requesting PVR.

The Office Action cites Lu at column 10, lines 10-15 as disclosing a request “that identifies one of the associated first and second network addresses.” *See* May 29, 2007 Office Action at page 4 and December 4, 2006 Office Action at page 4. This portion of Lu states, however, the following:

Furthermore, the programming instructions of step 512 may also include an Internet Protocol (IP) address of a device (e.g., personalized video recorder 200) that the personalized video recorder (e.g., 200A or 200B) should transmit the requested television show to once it has been recorded.

Lu at column 10, lines 10-15. This portion of Lu merely indicates the IP address of the location in which the recorded show will be sent. This passage of Lu does not, however, teach or suggest “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives **a request that identifies** one of the associated first and second network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery,” as recited in claim 1, for example. Thus, for at least this reason, Lu does not anticipate claims 1-17.

Additionally, the Office Action cites Lu at column 6, lines 45-50 as disclosing “respond[ing to a request that identifies one of the associated first and second network addresses] by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses” *See* May 29, 2007 Office Action at page 4 and December 4, 2006 Office Action at page 4. This portion of Lu states, however, the following:

Upon reception of the request from personalized video recorder 200, EPG server computer **locates** via Internet 302 one or more personalized video recorders (e.g., 200A and/or 200B) situated within a broadcast region of the requested television show.

See Lu at column 6, lines 45-50. The “request” mentioned in this passage is a “request [for] delivery of a specific television show that may not be available to him or her.” *See id.* at column 6, lines 43-45. In response to the request for delivery, Lu discloses that the EPG server “locates one or more personalized video recorders situated within a broadcast region of the requested television show.” Location of an arbitrary recorder within a particular broadcast region in response to a request for delivery of a particular television show is not a response to a request that identifies one of the associated first and second network addresses that “identif[ies] the other of the associated first and second network addresses to support delivery,” as recited in claim 1.

In response to the Applicants, the Office Action counters with the following:

[The Applicants argue that] Lu does not teach or suggest “receiving a request identifying one of the network protocol addresses and responding by identifying the other”.... In response to applicant’s argument, Lu teaches PVR 200 sends a request to EPG server 304 to locate PVR 200A and/or PVR 200B (**Col 6, lines 43-50**), and each PVR is associated with an IP addresses so each PVR could communicate with one another (**Col 10 lines 10-12**). In order for PVR to communicate with one another in a networked environment, each device is having a network address. PVR 200 is requesting for content and based on the request from PVR 200, PVR 200A/200B is responding with the requested content. Network addresses of are identified at each device to enable network communication with data transmission.

See May 29, 2007 Office Action at page 2 (emphasis added).

As discussed at length above, Lu simply does not describe, teach, or suggest, however, “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives a request that identifies one of the associated first and second

network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery,” as recited in claim 1. The Office Action cites to column 6, lines 43-50 and column 10, lines 10-12 of Lu as disclosing these limitations. As shown below, however, there is nothing in these cited portions of Lu that describes, teaches or suggests the relevant claim limitations.

First, Lu at column 6, lines 43-50 states the following:

The user of personalized video recorder 200 utilizes the EPG to **request delivery of a specific television show that may not be available to him or her.** Upon reception of the request from personalized video record 200, EPG server computer 304 **locates via Internet 302 one or more personalized video recorders (e.g., 200A and/or 200B)** situated within a broadcast region of the requested television show.

See Lu at column 6, lines 43-50 (emphasis added). Thus, in Lu, a user “requests delivery of a specific television show that may not be available to him or her.” In response to that request for an “unavailable television show,” the EPG server **arbitrarily locates a video recorder in a broadcast region of that television show.**

Claim 1 recites, however, “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives a request that identifies one of the associated first and second network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery.” Neither the portions of Lu cited in the Office Action, nor the remainder of Lu, describe, teach or suggest such limitations. An EPG server arbitrarily finding a video recorder in a broadcast area of a television show in response to a request for delivery of that show is not an EPG server that “responds by identifying

the other of the associated first and second network addresses to support delivery,” as recited in claim 1, for example.

Next, Lu at column 10, lines 10-12 recites the following:

Furthermore, the programming instructions of step 512 may also include an Internet Protocol (IP) address of a device (e.g., personalized video recorder 200) that the personalized video recorder (e.g., 200A or 200B) should transmit the requested television show to once it has been recorded.

This portion of Lu merely discloses that a recorded television show is transmitted to an IP address once it is recorded. Again, however, there simply is nothing in this portion of Lu that describes, teaches or suggests “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives **a request that identifies** one of the associated first and second network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery,” as recited in claim 1.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Lu does not describe, teach or suggest “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives **a request that identifies** one of the associated first and second network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery,” as recited in claim 1, or “server software that **maintains a user defined association of the first and second network addresses** and that receives **a request that identifies** one of the associated first and second network addresses and **responds by identifying the other of the associated first and second network addresses** to support delivery,” as recited in claim 8. Thus, for at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that Lu does not anticipate claims 1-17 of the present application.

II. Lu Does Not Anticipate Claims 18-24

Claim 18 recites, in part, “a closed and secure communication network, wherein the media is delivered from the first storage to the television display via the closed and secure communication network.” Lu does not describe, teach, or suggest such a limitation. Instead, Lu arbitrarily locates a PVR in a broadcast area to record a show for a PVR in another broadcast area over an open communication network (e.g., the Internet). Thus, Lu does not anticipate claims 18-24 for at least this reason.

In response to the Applicants, the Office Action states the following:

[The Applicants argue that] Lu does not teach “a closed and secure communication network, wherein the media is delivered from the first storage to the television display via the closed and secure communication network,”..... In response to applicant’s argument, all the PVRs are managed by the EPG server, which forms closed and secure communication network among all the PVRs and servers (see figure 4 and Col 8 lines 31-46).

See May 29, 2007 Office Action at pages 2-3.

As specifically disclosed in Lu, however, “EPG server computer 304 **locates via Internet 302 one or more personalized video recorders** (e.g., 200A and/or 200B) **situated within a broadcast region of the requested television show.**” *See* Lu at column 6, lines 43-50. The Applicants respectfully submit that arbitrarily locating PVRs via the Internet within a sprawling broadcast region of a television show is by no means a “closed and secure communication network,” as recited in claim 18.

Further, as noted above, the Office Action cites Lu at column 8, lines 31-46 as disclosing a “closed and secure communication network.” This portion of Lu states, however, the following:

It is appreciated that network 400 of FIG. 4 may be modified by enabling it to operate **with any type of media content (e.g., audio, video, graphics, information, data, software, and/or the like) in any type of forma.** For example, the television content providers (e.g., television head-ends 306 and 308) may be substituted with any type of media content providers. Additionally, the EPG server computer 304 may be modified such that its EPG provides a management system to personalized video recorders (e.g., 200 and 200C) for any type of media content. Furthermore, the EPG server computer 304 may also be modified such that it does not provide an EPG to personalized video recorders (e.g., 200 and 200C), but instead provides them a different type of management system for any type of media content. Moreover, the cache server 402 may be modified such that it operates with any type of media content.

Lu at column 8, lines 31-36. Modifying a network to enable it “to operate with any type of media content,” as disclosed in this passage of Lu, does not make it a “closed and secure communication network.” No matter how the network is modified, Lu still teaches that the “EPG server computer 304 **locates via Internet 302 one or more personalized video recorders (e.g., 200A and/or 200B) situated within a broadcast region of the requested television show.**” See Lu at column 6, lines 43-50. The Office Action does not explain how the above portion of Lu that teaches modifying a network to enable it to operate with any type of media content discloses a “closed and secure communication network.” Nor has the Office Action explained how Lu’s express teaching of arbitrary location via the Internet of a PVR within a broadcast region of a television show discloses a “closed and communication network.” Indeed, the Applicants respectfully submit that Lu expressly teaches away from a “closed and secure communication network.” For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to claims 18-24.

III. Claims 25-31 Are In Condition For Allowance

Claims 25-31, as amended, are in condition for allowance over Lu for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1-7.

IV. Conclusion

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding claims 1-31 and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. The Applicants expressly reserve the right, however, to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in future rejection).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of anticipation with respect to any of the pending claims for at least the reasons discussed above and request that the outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicants can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees, or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 1, 2007

MCANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100

/Joseph M. Butscher/
Joseph M. Butscher
Registration No. 48,326
Attorney for Applicants